

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated November 23, 2005 and the Advisory Action dated March 4, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Previously Claims 9 and 11-34 were pending in the application. Claims 9, 16, 24, 29, 32, and 33 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the entire specification. Page 11 of the specification and the figure 2 of the application, for example, show the amended features. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

The Examiner has rejected in the Final Office Action claims 24-28 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected in the Final Office Action claims 9 and 11-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonora et al., U.S. 5,895,191 (hereinafter "Bonora") in view of Briner et al., U.S. 5,810,537 (hereinafter "Briner") for the reasons stated on pages 3-4 of the final office action. The Examiner has also rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonora in view of Briner, and further in view of Mastroianni (U.S. 6,068,668) for the reasons stated on pages 4-5 of the final office action.

Claim 9 recites a loader disposed in a low cleanliness room in a border between the low cleanliness room and a high cleanliness room having a higher pressure than the low cleanliness room, the loader comprises: a movable stage for mounting a container in such a manner that an entire of the container remains in the low cleanliness room, and a cover to be removed from a main body of the container is positioned to face the high cleanliness room, the movable stage being horizontally movable relative to a wall that separates the low cleanliness room from the high cleanliness room; an opening portion in the wall through which a dust free article is transported between an inside of the container and the high cleanliness room; a door for opening and closing the opening portion; a unifying means for unifying the cover of the container and the door in the low cleanliness room; a driving apparatus for

KAW 98-2018-C
10/036,802

moving the cover and the door together within the loader to simultaneously open and close the opening portion and the container; and a gap provided between the opening portion and the door through which air flows out from the high cleanliness room to the lower cleanliness room to prevent dust flowing into the high cleanliness room.

On the contrary, Figs. 10-15 of Bonora disclose that a part of a container (60) with a box cover protrudes into a work station, i.e., high cleanliness room. Therefore, Bonora fails to teach or suggest the element "a movable stage for mounting a container in such a manner that an entire of the container remains in the low cleanliness room, and a cover to be removed from a main body of the container is positioned to face the high cleanliness room", as recited in claim 9. Briner also fails to teach or suggest the element "a movable stage for mounting a container in such a manner that an entire of the container remains in the low cleanliness room, and a cover to be removed from a main body of the container is positioned to face the high cleanliness room", as recited in claim 9. Thus, even though Bonora is combined with Briner, the combination does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 9.

The combination, further, fails to teach or suggest the element "the movable stage being horizontally movable relative to a wall that separates the low cleanliness room from the high cleanliness room", as recited in claim 9. As stated in the response filed February 16, 2005, the platform (116), in Bonora, is not movable but fixed on the process tool (150). The Examiner, however, stated on the Advisory Action that the lift ring 16 of Briner is movable and can be considered part of the stage. Fig. 4 of Briner discloses that the lift ring (16) was lifted with the box (36) by a flexible isolator means (18), a platform, and a mechanism for the lifting the platform. The lift ring (16) of Fig. 4 of Briner, however, is not horizontally movable relative to a wall (24). Therefore, Briner does not cure the deficiency of Bonora. According, the combination of Briner and Bonora does not render claim 9 obvious because the combination fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 9.

Since they contains similar elements, claims 16, 24, 29, and 32 are believed to be patentable over the combination of Bonora and Briner for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 11-15 depend from claim 9, claims 17-23 depend from claim 16, claims 25-28 depend from claim 24, claims 30-31 depend from claim 29, and claim 33 depends

from claim 32. Thus, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claims 9, 16, 24, 29, and 32.

The device of Mastroianni neither teaches nor suggests the elements "a movable stage for mounting a container in such a manner that an entire of the container remains in a low cleanliness room, and a cover to be removed from a main body of the container is positioned to face a high cleanliness room having a higher pressure than the low cleanliness room, the movable stage being horizontally movable relative to a wall that separates the low cleanliness room from the high cleanliness room", as recited in claim 32, from which claim 34 depends. Thus, Mastroianni does not cure the deficiency of the combination of Bonora and Briner. The combination of Bonora, Briner, and Mastroianni does not render claim 32 obvious, because the combination does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 32. Accordingly, claim 34 is believed to be allowable due to its dependency on claim 32.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Soonja Bac

Registration No.: See Attached
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: April 21, 2005

KAW 98-2018-C
10/036,802

10